

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant:

Taro HASHIMOTO et al.

Title:

SERVER/CLIENT SYSTEM, LOAD DISTRIBUTION DEVICE,  
LOAD DISTRIBUTION METHOD, AND LOAD DISTRIBUTION  
PROGRAM

Appl. No.:

10/583,358

International

12/18/2003

Filing Date:

06/19/06

371(c) Date:

Examiner:

Brian Chew

Art Unit:

2195

Confirmation

8189

Number:

**STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW**

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
Sir:

In accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.133, submitted herewith is a record of the substance of the interview conducted on March 10, 2011, with Examiner Chew, regarding the above-captioned application. It is submitted that the Interview Summary (a copy of which is attached) provides a complete and proper recordation of the substance of the interview, per MPEP §713.04. This statement is being submitted within one (1) month of the mailing date March 16, 2011 of the Interview Summary and is therefore a timely response.

Respectfully submitted,

Date 4/13/11

By 

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP  
Customer Number: 22428  
Telephone: (202) 672-5540  
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

W. Keith Robinson  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 59,396

<b><i>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</i></b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/583,358 Examiner BRIAN CHEW	HASHIMOTO ET AL. Art Unit 2195
<b>All Participants:</b>	<b>Status of Application:</b> _____	
(1) <u>BRIAN CHEW</u> .	(3) _____	
(2) <u>W. Keith Robinson (Reg. No. 59,396)</u> .	(4) _____	
<b>Date of Interview:</b> <u>10 March 2011</u>	<b>Time:</b> <u>9:30AM ET</u>	
<b>Type of Interview:</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Telephonic <input type="checkbox"/> Video Conference <input type="checkbox"/> Personal (Copy given to: <input type="checkbox"/> Applicant <input type="checkbox"/> Applicant's representative)		
<b>Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No If Yes, provide a brief description: _____		
<b>Part I.</b> <b>Rejection(s) discussed:</b>  Claims discussed: 14, 17, 20 and 23		
<b>Prior art documents discussed:</b>  <b>Part II.</b> <b>SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:</b> <i>Discussed a brief explanation of the invention, particularly with regards to the first distance being a normal that connects the estimation point and the ideal consumption line. Applicant agreed to amend claims according to examiner amendment on 10 March 2011 to overcome prior art.</i>		
<b>Part III.</b> <input type="checkbox"/> It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. <input type="checkbox"/> It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.		
/Meng-Ai An/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2195 /B. C./ Examiner, Art Unit 2195		
(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)		